Agenda

08:00  Welcome, Introductions & Overview
08:15  SCORP Purpose, History & Basic Requirements
08:50  Similarities & Challenges ~ group activity
09:05  Innovations & Efficiencies ~ panel discussion about strategies to produce ‘SCORPs on a Budget’ (AL, AR, AZ, AS)
10:00  Break
10:15  Small Group Discussions
11:25  Report out & Lessons Learned
11:50  Planning Resources ~ future discussions & opportunities
11:55  Closing
SCORP Implementation – Context & Implementation

• For many federal programs States must periodically submit an assessment of need that describes how grant funds will be spent over the next xx years if Congress apportions the grant $ in the federal budget. Such reports assure Congress and the public that the funds will be spent appropriately to address the State’s valid and unique needs.

• Currently SCORPs have a 5 year planning horizon.

• The author (the LWCF State Liaison Officer or SLO & staff) does not control which capital projects are proposed each year. That is decided by parks departments that apply for grants annually or bi-annually, not the SLO staff. So, the SCORP 5-year update is ‘aspirational’ rather than ‘definitive’.
SCORP Implementation – Context & Implementation

- The SCORP Update provides priority project types rather than specific projects. This makes the SCORP a generalized policy document.

- The single aspect of the required ‘Implementation Plan’ controlled by the SLO staff is the scoring criteria for the LWCF Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) used to rank LWCF grant applications for funding.

- Thus, the most recent SCORP update goals should be incorporated into the State’s grant competition scoring criteria to ensure LWCF is funding projects addressing needs identified in the SCORP.
Keep the audience(s) in mind

The SCORP should be useful to:

• Decision makers in state and local government deciding which capital projects to approve or fund through grants;

• Private sector recreation providers (and allied industries) deciding what facilities to invest in;

• Economic development, tourism, public health, or climate change policy makers evaluating how public infrastructure affect those other policies;

• The public who are interested in / advocating for public outdoor recreation in their communities;

• Federal agencies evaluating their own facilities build-out plans and policies; and

• Academic researchers.
Minimum requirements

- Identify **outdoor recreation issues of statewide importance** (issues the State will address through the LWCF vs. issues addressed by other means);

- **Evaluate demand and supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities**, but not necessarily through quantitative statewide inventories.

- An implementation plan. *“Ensure relevant, influential and timely planning for the State's use of its LWCF apportionment.”* The SCORP’s priorities and actions in sufficient detail **to develop criteria for the Open Project Selection Process (OPSP)** so LWCF projects implement the SCORP.
• Process must include **ample opportunity for public participation** involving all segments of the state's population.

• Describe the **process and methodologies** to meet the guidelines in this section.

• The plan **may consist of a single document or may be comprised of multiple documents** as long as the guidelines as set forth in this section are met.

• The plan **must contain or reference a wetlands** priority component consistent with Section 303 of the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986.
Other (mandatory) requirements:

- The name of the state agency that will have the authority to represent and act for the State in dealing with the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the LWCF Act of 1965, as amended.

- Certification by the Governor that ample opportunity for public participation has taken place in plan development.

- The SCORP shall take into account relevant federal resources and programs and shall be correlated so far as practicable with other state, regional and local plans.
A program for implementation of the plan

- The SCORP implementation plan is not required to identify specific timelines or funding sources. A list or matrix of what/who is sufficient.

- Linking the what/who to specific priorities is a great idea.

| **Health and Wellness:** Promoting Healthy Living Through Outdoor Connections |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| **Recommendations and Action Steps** | **Implementing Partners** |
| 1. Reconnect people to the outdoors through recreation opportunities and experiences. |
| a. Celebrate Get Outdoors PA annually with special Get Outdoors Days hosted by regional community partners that offer instructional programs for various outdoor recreation activities. | Get Outdoors PA Flagship and Community Partners |
| b. Provide templates to state and local parks agencies for them to list amenities, resources and educational materials so school’s and youth-based organizations can more easily incorporate local outdoor activities into curricula. | DCNR, DOH, PDE, PRPS, PSAPHERD, PHMC, PRO Wellness |
| c. Use the PA Department of Health’s 15 pilot school districts to develop, implement and evaluate comprehensive school physical activity programs, and identify opportunities to connect youth to the outdoors through places for physical activity. | DOH, PDE, DCNR, PSAPHERD, Pro Wellness, PennDOT, University of Pittsburgh |
| d. Provide a best-practices forum to encourage local efforts to use technology to design and develop programs that link people to the outdoors. | Get Outdoors PA Flagship Partners, PSAPHERD |
Perhaps the most difficult element ~ evaluation of the demand for and supply of outdoor recreation resources and facilities in the State

How to begin?
The Quantitative Approach:

Statistically valid surveys of recreation providers (about quantities of current recreation facilities, future needs, and visitor counts) and resident and tourists/visitors (about current and future recreation activities and desires).

**Pros:** Not required, but wonderful base data for a SCORP and other statewide recreation planning initiatives as well a providing a resource for local government and non-profit decision makers.

**Cons:** Difficult to achieve on a budget; generally relies on partnering with universities or consulting firms which adds to the cost and management burdens; methodologies must be well-planned out; requires quality data analysis skills on the SCORP writing team in addition to data collection skills. For all these reasons this is not the most common approach for recent SCORP updates.

“... The sample was designed to derive information at the county level, providing close-to-home survey results for local recreation planners to use in Oregon’s 36 counties. A total of 8,860 randomly selected Oregonians completed a survey questionnaire.

This is the first SCORP plan in the U.S. to provide statistically reliable survey results at the county level. A summary of statewide and region scale survey results is included in a chapter of this plan. ...”
Statistically valid survey yields statewide assessment of recreation priorities

- From OR SCORP 2013-2017 additional document, pg. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Close-To-Home Priorities</th>
<th>Dispersed-Area Priorities</th>
<th>Oregon Resident Survey</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community trail systems</td>
<td>Group campgrounds &amp; facilities</td>
<td>Dirt / other soft surface walking</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s playgrounds</td>
<td>RV / trailer campgrounds &amp; facilities</td>
<td>and paths</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of trail corridors &amp; ROWs</td>
<td>Public restroom facilities</td>
<td>Public access sites to waterways</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails connected to public lands</td>
<td>Tent campgrounds &amp; facilities</td>
<td>Nature and wildlife viewing areas</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public restroom facilities</td>
<td>Group day-use &amp; facilities</td>
<td>Children’s playgrounds and play</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking / day-use facilities</td>
<td>Acquisition of trail corridors &amp; ROWs</td>
<td>areas made of natural materials</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Natural Play Areas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic areas and shelters for small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>visitor groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off-street bicycle trails and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pathways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved / hard surface walking trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and paths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off-leash dog areas</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Qualitative Approach:
Ascertain public outdoor recreation trends and needs based on input from knowledgeable advisors, the public, and published trends

- **Literature Review** ~ Gather current ‘Comprehensive Plans’ (aka ‘Parks, Recreation, and Open Space’ plans) and recent park-specific development plans from several public recreation providers across the state. Strive for a range of sources and locations to get a balanced picture of what public recreation providers and the public have been discussing since the last SCORP was created. Read the plans’ conclusions and recommendations. Can you discern trends associated with communities to be served and/or types of recreational facilities in either increasing or decreasing demand? Does it vary by geographic region, age group, race, or recreational facility type? Is there a nexus with other statewide priorities (e.g. public health initiatives, tourism, economic development, climate change, a change in land use regulations, etc.)? Summarize what the literature review suggests about current recreational deficits / needs as part of the SCORP’s ‘Supply and Demand’ section.

- **Advisory Committee** ~ Recruit and convene a committee of manageable size for broad guidance and buy-in at a high level (senior SCORP-writing department leaders, elected officials or their representatives, state and federal government agency representatives, economic development and tourism leaders, university researchers, etc.).

- **Steering Committee** ~ Recruit and convene a smaller committee of SCORP-writing departmental leaders, recreation professionals, and advocates for more detailed guidance and reaction during SCORP development. Consider a standing committee that meets semi-annually to keep momentum and institutional memory going. Considering including current and recent members of the LWCF Open Project Selection Process (OPSP) grant application scoring panel as they are very knowledgeable about what local governments are trying to build in response to recent public demand.

- **Focus groups** ~ Convene invitation-only small group discussions in various parts of the state with recreation providers, organized advocacy groups, and community members with expertise on issues the SCORP might address.

- **Surveys** ~ In-person at parks, online, by invitation, by phone

- **Public Meetings** ~ Note: Sometimes the public participates more after a draft plan is available because it is something to react / respond to (e.g. during the public comment period after a DRAFT SCORP is released). Incorporate public comments into the FINAL SCORP submitted to NPS by making changes to the text where deemed appropriate; include raw comments and agency responses in an appendix.

Layer and combine these tools and techniques as appropriate to your State’s needs, budget, and staff resources
Examine demographic data; consider the State’s regions varying needs

**Example:**
Evaluating population trends by region. The results are linked to estimate of future recreation resource needs addressing population changes.

Introduces the State-selected level of service (LOS) metric.

- From FL 2013-2018 SCORP, p. 51
Coming to conclusions:

Pull results together in useful summary fashion

Example:
Statewide summary of demand by user (resident/tourist) and activity

- From FL 2013-2018 SCORP, p. 48
Coming to conclusions:

Example:

Summary of outdoor recreation demand & supply by region within a State/Territory expressed through the State-determined Level of Service (LOS) metric

- From FL 2013-2018 SCORP, p. 52
SCORP common weaknesses

- Overly dependent on data collection without linking it to reasonable conclusions
- Narrowly focused on a segment of the outdoor recreation (e.g. only Federal or State-administered resources or just a few recreation opportunities)
- Insufficient public involvement
- Lack of implementation plan and/or no linkage to OPSP
Agenda

08:00  Welcome, Introductions & Overview
08:15  SCORP Purpose, History & Basic Requirements
08:50  Similarities & Challenges ~ group activity
09:05  Innovations & Efficiencies ~ panel discussion about strategies to produce ‘SCORPs on a Budget’ (AL, AR, AZ, AS)
10:00  Break
10:15  Small Group Discussions
11:25  Report out & Lessons Learned
11:50  Planning Resources ~ future discussions & opportunities
11:55  Closing
Thank you!